

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

	X
	:
HUMBERTO LOZADA and OKLAHOMA	:
FIREFIGHTERS PENSION AND RETIREMENT	:
SYSTEM Individually and on Behalf of All Others	:
Similarly Situated,	22 Civ. 1479 (JPC) (GS)
	:
Plaintiffs,	<u>ORDER ADOPTING</u>
	<u>REPORT AND</u>
	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
-v-	:
	:
TASKUS, INC. <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	:
Defendants.	:
	:

X

JOHN P. CRONAN, United States District Judge:

On February 24, 2025, Plaintiffs Humberto Lozada and Oklahoma Firefighters Pension and Retirement System filed an Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. Dkt. 175. On May 28, 2025, the Honorable Gary Stein, to whom this case has been referred for general supervision of pretrial proceedings and dispositive motions, issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Court grant Plaintiffs' motion and enter an order preliminarily approving the settlement and providing for notice to the putative class. Dkt. 188.

A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge" in a Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party submits a timely objection to any part of the magistrate judge's disposition, the district court will conduct a *de novo* review of the contested section. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also United States v. Male Juvenile*, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir. 1997). If no objections are made, the Court reviews the Report and Recommendation for clear error. *See, e.g., Wilds v. United Parcel Serv.*, 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).

The Report and Recommendation, citing both Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), advised the parties that they had fourteen days from service of the Report and Recommendation to file any objections, and warned that failure to timely file such objections would result in waiver of any right to object. Dkt. 188. No objections have been filed and the time for making any objections has passed. The parties have therefore waived the right to object to the Report and Recommendation or to obtain appellate review. *See Frank v. Johnson*, 968 F.2d 298, 300 (2d Cir. 1992).

Notwithstanding this waiver, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the Report and Recommendation, and finds it to be well founded. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety and will separately enter an order in substantially the form annexed to the Report and Recommendation preliminarily approving the proposed settlement and providing for class notice. The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close Docket Number 175.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 13, 2025  
New York, New York



JOHN P. CRONAN  
United States District Judge